Info-ParaNet Newsletters Volume I Number 330

Monday, November 12th 1990

Today's Topics:

Re: Conclusion - Gulf Breeze
Re: GB Sentinel
Re: Walters case
Davis Sea Happenings
Re: Santa Barbara (Continued)
Santa Barbara (Continued)
GB Photos
Re: Ed Walters video

Moderator's Note: Mike Corbin is in transit to Wyoming as he has a sickness in his family. He will be out of touch for about 7-10 days. Please send nothing in the way of articles during this time as they may get deleted or lost before he is back up.
-Cyro (Moderator at UUCP/INTERNET/USENET host site.)

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Re: Conclusion - Gulf Breeze
Date: 9 Nov 90 16:11:03 GMT

> From what I read in Saucer Smear, it looks like Ed had
> big plans on starting his own newsletter or magazine which was
> to begin publication next month.

No ideas about that.
Look around for a new file called GBREFUTE.ZIP. Interesting.

jbh

--
John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Re: GB Sentinel
Date: 9 Nov 90 16:13:04 GMT

> As long as Mr. Somerby likes to impugn motives, how about
> this one: What single publication in America had the most to

> gain from the Walters hoax?

Aw, c'mon now. Do you really think a publisher of a lowly weekly newspaper would stoop to such things. ;-)

jbh

--
John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Re: Walters case
Date: 9 Nov 90 16:22:05 GMT

> So Dan Wright says that MUFON is concerned that one of
> their investigators has taken sides in a political dispu.

Yeah, interesting isn't it.

I got a copy of Don Ware's original letter to the editors of the News-Journal and the Sentinel. Actually, it's signed by both Don and Charles.

The letter contains three long paragraphs which attempt to refute Rex's findings re: the Road Shot, which is well and good, but the fourth and final paragraph simply states that they have gotten to know Ed and Frances well and wishes them luck.

The Sentinel folks apparently edited out the first three paragraphs, which were the meat and the intent of the letter, and just published the final paragraph, which looks like (out of context) a political endorsement. Which it isn't.

So, contrary to my initial statement based on the (edited) letter published in the Sentinel, the fact is that Don and Charles did *not* write a political endorsement of Ed, but part of their letter was taken out of context and made to *appear* to be just that.

Lousy, slanted and biased editing by whoever edits the letters to the editor for the Sentinel.

jbh

Neither a Debunker
nor a True Believer.

--
John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Davis Sea Happenings
Date: 9 Nov 90 16:27:06 GMT

> I'm hoping somebody can shed some additional light on an unusual
> story that appeared in the San Diego Union about three weeks ago
> (this was told to me by a reliable friend, and will try to
> further track down this story).

How about this possibility.
The egg-shaped craft may have been some sort of submersible servicing, laying or retrieving sonobuoys. Everyone's navy would probably want to keep such ops secret.

jbh

--
John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: Re: Santa Barbara (Continued)
Date: 9 Nov 90 15:28:00 GMT

> What is the basis for the suggestion that some of the Roswell witnesses
> may be given immunity?? Has the gvt been approached? By whom? With what
> response? Who specifically was approached?

CUFOS has apparently petitioned some Congresscritters on behalf of several individuals connected with the case, one of whom was in charge of securing the perimeter of the crash site. I don't know if there has been a response yet, apparently it is a work in progress.

> Another question that comes to mind is would it be a violation of an
> oath of silence to simply say "I can't tell you what I know but the gvt
> statements as to what happened are not true."

Don Schmitt asked one of these individuals if we are "on the right track," meaning, are we justified in exploring the alien spacecraft possibility. His response was, "well, off the record, you're not on the wrong track."

Jim

--
Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: Santa Barbara (Continued)
Date: 10 Nov 90 23:55:00 GMT

> > may be granted immunity for their testimony,
>
> and I'm wondering (a rhetorical) why.
>

Immunity meaning, they won't be prosecuted for violating any secrecy oaths if they should testify.

Jim

--
Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: GB Photos
Date: 11 Nov 90 00:01:00 GMT

> So lemme see if I got this right: The book written by the professionals
> goes unnoticed and the book written by the architect generates a furor.
>
>

Ya see now why PR experts get such big bucks?

I think the differences are, 1) GB has the steadfast support of the largest UFO organization in the world, from the top down. 2) The leader of that organization has endorsed it as being genuine, whereas the lead investigators of HV (Hynek and Imbrogno) were always careful to couch their language in relatively (and properly) ambiguous terms. 3) and here's where the PR comes

in, Ed was published by a larger house, Morrow, than was Night Siege (Ballantine). And Ballantine sent Phil on a relatively small tour, whereas Ed has canvassed the country twice and is going again. Many other factors, too, such as the media coverage - the press decided early on that HV was a hoax by a bunch of pilots, and there didn't seem to be any changing their minds. GB had the luxury of occuring in the era of tabloid TV, and Ed took full advantage, appearing on Lard Copy, Inside Sedition, and A Torrid Affair.

Jim

--
Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Delton@p0.f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Delton)
Subject: Re: Ed Walters video
Date: 11 Nov 90 06:18:00 GMT

When My polaroid rollers are dirty they produce much different "lights" then I saw in Ed's photos. As an aside, do you think S-VHS is here to stay?? I also noticed on my camcorder that bright lights leave streaks vertically. SHould the light from the UFO or any of the other lights in Ed's recordings have left different streaks then they did??
I heard that Macabee may be revising his estimate of the size of the UFO in the "road" photo to twice as large and twice as far away. I remain confused as to why the obvious seems to be consitently ignored in that photo. It would seem that the size of the UFO is readily established due to it's close proximity to the road. Most roads of the sort shown in the photo are about 28 feet wide (the blacktop part). And there should be no problem actually measureing the road since Ed has said exactly where it is. Once the width of the road is known the diameter of the UFO would be easily established.
--
Jim Delton - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Delton@p0.f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG

********To have your comments in the next issue, send electronic mail to********
'infopara' at the following address:

UUCP	{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara
DOMAIN	infopara@scicom.alphacdc.com
ADMIN Address	infopara-request@scicom.alphacdc.com
	{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara-request

**********The**End**of**Info-ParaNet**Newsletter**********